



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/319,649	06/10/1999	TOMIHISA KAMADA	Y-163	3408

7590 06/05/2002

DELLETT & WALTERS
310 S W FOURTH AVENUE
SUITE 1101
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

TRAN, HAI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/319,649

Applicant(s)

KAMADA ET AL.

Examiner

Hai Tran

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herz et al. (US 5758257) in view of Williams et al. (US 5977964).

Regarding claim 1, Herz discloses a method for obtaining audience data on TV programs (Col. 6, lines 35-Col. 7, lines 5), in an audience data-obtaining device, which uses a computer, the method comprises:

Obtaining, from outside, TV program table data (program list; Fig. 9, Col. 45, lines 14-20) for an area where viewer resides (demographics; Col. 11, lines 58-65+).

Detecting a channel that is being viewed by the viewer (Col. 26, lines 57-62);

Obtaining audience data (Col. 26, lines 57-Col. 27, lines 5; the customer profile is adjusted according to user selection of video program watched), which include viewed channel information and viewed time information of TV based on result of the detecting of the viewed channel (Col. 4, lines 59-Col. 5, lines 4);

Obtaining at least a program ID (particular video descriptive; Col. 4, lines 65+) of a viewed program from the TV program table data, by comparing the audience data (user profile) with the TV program table data (Col. 26, lines 57-Col. 27, lines 5).

Herz does not disclose transferring, via Internet to a collection center, the obtained program ID and the viewed time information along with ID data of viewer. However, Herz discloses the customer profile data and viewing habit data collected at set top box is periodically uploaded to the headend via return path 510 of Fig. 5 and 10 (Col. 42, lines 1-11).

Williams discloses user profile is collected at PC then transmits back to the Web server through Internet (Fig. 1, element 104 and 128; Col. 6, lines 17-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Herz to use Internet to transfer user profile, as taught by Williams, so to provide to user a flexibility to configure its system to store or to retrieve entertainment programming information from a wide variety of sources (Col. 3, lines 13-15).

Regarding claim 2, Williams further discloses the step of obtaining TV program table (program list) include automatically and regularly obtaining the TV program table data by use of the Internet or a broadcasting medium and the step of transferring includes automatically and regularly performing the transmission to the collection center (Col. 41, lines 15-42).

Regarding claim 3, with respect to the same analysis to claim 2, Herz (Col. 51, lines 5-8) further discloses by making use of opportunities of the viewer's accessing the Internet.

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Williams discloses a "convergence system" designed to integrate the world of entertainment system and computing platforms to achieve the beneficial results discussed. Therefore, Williams's system must have the capability to transfer/transmit data having an HTML format using Internet connection as disclosed (see analysis of claim 1).

Regarding claims 6 and 11, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to method claim 1.

Regarding claim 7, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to method claim 2.

Regarding claim 8, the apparatus claim is analyzed with respect to method claim 3.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, see analysis of claim 3.

2. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herz et al. (US 5758257) in view of Williams et al. (US 5977964), and further in view of Rothmuller (US 5635989).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Herz and Williams do not clearly disclose the step of obtaining audience data includes ignoring a continuously viewed time of a program when the viewed time is shorter than a predetermined time.

Art Unit: 2611

Rothmuller shows a system to obtain/store a viewed program in the favorite list if the program is viewed for more than a predetermined period of time (Fig. 4, Col. 5, lines 59-66). Programs that user merely scan through are exclude from the favorite list. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Herz in view of Williams to obtain only viewed program for more than a predetermined period of time, as taught by Rothmuller, so to insure that the user has more than just a passing interest in the program.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2611

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bedard (US 5801747) shows a method and apparatus for creating a television viewer profile.

Gardell et al. (US 6049831) shows a system for transmitting network-related information where requested network information is separately transmitted as definitions and display information.

Hite et al. (US 5774170) shows system and method for delivering targeted advertisements to consumers.

Contact Fax Information

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-7372. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377

HT:ht
5/31/02


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600